



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/592,912	12/14/2007	Xiu-Min Li	2005577-0009	5719

24280 7590 08/24/2009
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

WINSTON, RANDALL O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1655

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

08/24/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@choate.com

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgement is made of the receipt and entry of the amendment filed on 05/19/2009.

Claims 1-14 have been examined on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu (Derwent ACC-NO 2002-217632 or CN 1327805, see abstract) in view of Hwange et al. (US 6,869,621), Prakash et al. (US 20040103908) and Houck et al. (US 20030130200) for the reasons set forth in the previous OFFICE ACTION which are restated below.

Applicant claims a herbal formulation and method for treating and/or lessening the severity of asthma, wherein said formulation consist of Ku-Shen (i.e. sophora root), Ling-zhi (i.e. Reishi), Gan-Cao (i.e. licorice), corticosteroid, bronchodilator (i.e. inhaled) and a pharmaceutical carrier.

Liu teaches a composition (i.e. a pharmaceutical composition) containing Ku-Shen (i.e. sophora root) and a pharmaceutical carrier (i.e. the pharmaceutical could be water) to treat asthma. (see, e.g abstract). Yang, however, does not teach the other

Art Unit: 1655

claimed active ingredients such as Ling-zhi (i.e. Reishi), Gan-Cao (i.e. licorice), corticosteroid, bronchodilator (i.e. inhaled) within Liu's composition to treat asthma.

Hwange beneficially teaches that Ling-zhi (i.e. reishi) treats asthma (see. e.g. column 8 lines 4-12).

Prakash beneficially teaches Gan-Cao (i.e. licorice) treats asthma (see. e.g. paragraph 008).

Houck beneficially teaches corticosteroid and bronchodilator (i.e. an inhaled bronchodilator) treat asthma (see. e.g. paragraph 0005 and 0007).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Liu's herbal formulation to include the other claimed active ingredients as taught by Hwange, Prakash and Houck within Liu's herbal formulation whereby the above cited combined reference teaching as a whole would create the claimed herbal formation and/or claimed method comprising of the claimed active ingredients to treat asthma in a subject in need thereof. Moreover, when the same combined herbal formation as a whole as the claimed invention's herbal formulation is administered to a subject in need thereof to treat asthma, the same combined herbal formulation as a whole would intrinsically have the same claimed functional effects within a subject in need thereof body (i.e. the functional effect of suppressing GATA-3 in a subject in need thereof and/or suppressing the activation of memory Th2 cells in a subject in need thereof) as the claimed inventions. Furthermore, as discussed in MPEP Section 2114.06, "it is *prima facie* obvious to combine two or more compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same

Art Unit: 1655

purpose (i.e. to treat asthma in a subject in need thereof), in order to form a third composition to used for the same purpose.” Moreover, the adjustment of other conventional working conditions (e.g. determining suitable amounts/ranges of each active ingredient within the claimed composition), is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

Accordingly, the claimed invention was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Applicant arguments have been fully considered but they are not deemed persuasive. Applicant argues that one skilled in the art of medicinal herbal formulations would not simply conclude that a single component of an eight component formulation could be used successfully for the same therapeutic purpose as the more complex formulation. Moreover, Applicant argues that the Declaration that includes Exhibit A filed on 05/19/2009 and Applicant's working examples clearly establishes that the combination of ingredients has a synergistic effect.

Although Applicant argues that one skilled in the art of medicinal herbal formulations would not simply conclude that a single component of an eight component formulation could be used successfully for the same therapeutic purpose as the more complex formulation, Applicant argument is not found persuasive because since the other cited secondary references are cited by examiner to remedy Liu's deficiencies, it

Art Unit: 1655

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Liu's herbal formulation to include the other claimed active ingredients as taught by Hwange, Prakash and Houck within Liu's herbal formulation whereby the above cited combined reference teaching as a whole would create the claimed herbal formation and/or claimed method comprising of the claimed active ingredients to treat asthma in a subject in need thereof. Furthermore, as discussed in MPEP Section 2114.06, "it is *prima facie* obvious to combine two or more compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose (i.e. to treat asthma in a subject in need thereof), in order to form a third composition to used for the same purpose."

Moreover, although Applicant argues that the Declaration that includes Exhibit A filed on 05/19/2009 and Applicant's working examples clearly establishes that the combination of ingredients has a synergistic effect, Applicant argument is not found persuasive because it appears to examiner that applicant has not claimed any specific effective amounts and/or ranges of active ingredients within its claimed composition of claims 1-14 to determine whether applicants' claimed composition invention demonstrates unexpected results and synergism. What specific effective amounts and/or ranges of active ingredients within applicants' claimed composition of claims 1-14 (i.e. especially in independent claims 1) produce unexpected results and synergism?

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1655

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randall Winston whose telephone number is 571-272-0972. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on 571-272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1655

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RW

/Christopher R. Tate/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655